

REMARKS

Summary of the Office Action

Claims 1, 2, and 5-12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Nishiki et al. (US 5,946,060).

Claims 3 and 4 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nishiki et al. in view of Kim (US 5,338,240).

Claims 13-24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nishiki et al. in view of Applicant's Disclosed Related Art and Kim.

Summary of the Response to the Office Action

Applicant has amended claims 1, 10, and 19 to further define the invention, amended claim 4 to correct a minor informality unrelated to patentability, and added new claims 25-39. Accordingly, claims 1-39 are pending for consideration.

Claims Define Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 1, 2, and 5-12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Nishiki et al. (US 5,946,060), claims 3 and 4 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nishiki et al. in view of Kim (US 5,338,240), and claims 13-24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nishiki et al. in view of Applicant's Disclosed Related Art and Kim. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections as being based upon a combination of references that neither teaches nor suggests the novel combination of features recited in amended independent claims 1, 10, and 19, and hence dependent claims 2-9, 11-18, and 20-24.

Independent claim 1, as amended, recites a liquid crystal display panel including a plurality of side and pixel electrodes, wherein “side portions of the side electrodes are coplanar with side portions of the pixel electrodes along a surface of the insulating layer.” Similarly, independent claim 10, as amended, recites a liquid crystal display panel including a plurality of side and pixel electrodes, wherein “side portions of the side electrodes are coplanar with side portions of the pixel electrodes along a surface of the second insulating layer.” Likewise, independent claim 19, as amended, recites a method for fabricating a liquid crystal display panel including steps of forming a plurality of side and pixel electrodes, wherein “side portions of the side electrodes are coplanar with side portions of the pixel electrodes along a surface of the passivation layer.”

In contrast to Applicant’s claimed invention, and as admitted by the Final Office Action, Nishiki et al. clearly discloses, in FIG. 2B, a plurality of data lines 2, pixel electrodes 4a, and side electrodes 5b. However, as disclosed throughout Nishiki et al., the side electrodes 5b are always disposed above the pixel electrodes 4a with the insulating layer 9 disposed therebetween, such that the side electrodes 5b and the pixel electrodes 4a are disposed on completely different planes. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully asserts that Nishiki et al. is completely silent with regard to “side portions of the side electrodes are coplanar with side portions of the pixel electrodes,” as required by amended independent claims 1, 10, and 19, and hence dependent claims 2-9, 11-18, and 20-24.

With regard to Kim, the Office Action admits that Nishiki et al. fails to teach “forming the pixel and side electrodes of the same material and a transparent conductive film.” Accordingly, the Final Office Action relies upon Kim for allegedly teaching patterning of

indium-tin-oxide “by conventional photolithography techniques (column 1 lines 48-55).” Thus, the Final Office Action concludes that “it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art [to] use ITO to enabling patterning by conventional photolithography techniques.” Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Applicant respectfully asserts that neither Nishiki et al. and Kim, whether taken singly or combined, teach or suggest forming pixel and side electrodes of the same transparent conductive material film. Although the Final Office Action admits that Nishiki et al. fails to teach “forming the pixel and side electrodes of the same material and a transparent conductive film,” the Final Office Action relies upon Kim for allegedly teaching the use of “conventional photolithography techniques.” However, Applicant respectfully asserts that Kim is completely silent with regard to forming pixel electrodes and side electrodes, which are two completely different structures disposed at different locations along the substrate, of a same material. In other words, although Kim may teach the use of “conventional photolithography techniques” for forming pixel electrodes, Kim is devoid of any teaching with regard to forming pixel and side electrodes of a same material. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully asserts that the Final Office Action fails to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness with regard to claims 3 and 4.

In addition, Applicant respectfully asserts that the Final Office Action does not rely upon Applicant’s Disclosed Related Art to remedy the above-detailed deficiencies of Nishiki et al. and Kim. Moreover, Applicant respectfully asserts that the Final Office Action cannot rely upon Applicant’s Disclosed Related Art to remedy the above-detailed deficiencies of Nishiki et al. and Kim, since Applicant’s Disclosed Related Art is completely silent with regard to a plurality of side electrodes overlapping a plurality of data lines along a length direction of the data lines and

side portions of the side electrodes being coplanar with side portions of the pixel electrodes.

For at least the above reasons, Applicant respectfully asserts that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102(b) and 103(a) should be withdrawn because the above-discussed novel combinations of features are neither taught nor suggested by any of the applied references, whether taken alone or in combination.

New Claims 25-39

Applicant adds new claims 25-39, and respectfully asserts that new claims 25-39 are allowable for at least the reasons presented above, as well as the combination of features they each recite.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims. Should the Examiner believe that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

If there is any fee due in connection with the filing of this Amendment, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.: 041993-5232
Application No.: 10/653,243
Page 17

C.F.R. § 1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

By: _____



David B. Hardy
Reg. No. 47,362

Dated: March 14, 2006

Customer No. 009629

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20004
202-739-3000